

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 04/15/2004 8316 10/825,461 Charles Patrick Murphy **EXAMINER** 21590 7590 11/16/2005 MYERS & KAPLAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC BARNEY, SETH E 1899 POWERS FERRY ROAD, SUITE 310 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER ATLANTA, GA 30339 3752

**DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005** 

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		O V
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/825,461	MURPHY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Seth Barney	3752
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
<ul> <li>1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Set</li> <li>2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.</li> <li>2b) ☐ This</li> <li>3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E</li> </ul>	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		•
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers  9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2005 is/are 10 is/a	vn from consideration.  relection requirement. r. ure: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objec	•
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	-, ,	• •
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 2-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5.964.420 to Hampton.

Regarding claim 2, Hampton discloses a broadcast spreader comprising:

-a main tube (22) having an intake and a discharge end. Although Hampton references (12) as the main tube in the specification, either tube (22) or (12) can be considered the main tube and the remaining tube can be considered the secondary tube.

- -a secondary tube (12) connected to the main tube.
- -a material flow control (24) connected to the secondary tube.
- -a control knob (25) connected to the flow control.

See Figure 1.

Regarding claim 3, the main tube and secondary tube are generally cylindrical.

Regarding claim 4, the hollow centers of the main tube and the secondary tube are in fluid communication.

Regarding claim 5, Hampton discloses that one having ordinary skill in the art can determine the optimum dimensions. See column 5 lines 27 to 34.

Regarding claim 6, the intake end of the main tube is for attachment to an external source of high velocity airflow.

Regarding claim 7, the hollow interior of the main tube receives the high velocity forced airflow.

Regarding claim 8, the hollow interior of the secondary tube is in fluid communication with the hollow interior of the main tube.

Regarding claim 9, the secondary tube is connected to the main tube at an acute angle with respect to the direction to the high velocity forced airflow. See column 4 line 57.

Regarding claim 10, the secondary tube includes a particulate matter flow. See column 5 lines 10 to 21.

Regarding claim 11, the particulate matter flow and the high velocity forced air are combined adjacent to the connection point. See Figure 1.

Regarding claim 12, the flows are combined through fluid mechanical forces, wherein the high velocity forced airflow applies a pulling force on the particulate flow.

Regarding claim 13, the fluid mechanical force is the venture effect.

Regarding claim 16, there is a hopper (15) connected to an end of the secondary tube upstream of the main tube. See Figure 1.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3752

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 5. Claim 1 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,256,241 to Mesic in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,761,157 to Bartek.

Regarding claims 1 and 17, Mesic discloses a particle spreader comprising:

- -a main tube (16)
- -a secondary tube (60)
- -means for controlling the volume of material dispensed (64) located on the secondary tube and upstream of a connection point (near 62 or 76) of the main tube and the secondary tube.
- -wherein an intake end is for connecting to a means for providing high velocity forced airflow (12) through a hollow interior of the main tube resulting in the broadcasting or spreading of the desired particulate matter that is recited from a particulate flow in the secondary tube and combined with the high velocity air flow. See Figure 1.

-so that particulate flowing through the secondary tube and the main tube do not engage with the means for providing high velocity forced airflow thereby resulting in little or no danger to the material broadcast over an area of ground.

Mesic does not expressly disclose the dimensions of the tubes angle of connection. Bartek discloses an analogous sprayer and that the dimensions of the sprayer can be optimized to achieve the desired amount of spraying. See column 3 lines 10 to 47. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the dimensions of Mesic as taught by Bartek in order to achieve the desired spraying.

Regarding claim 18, the main tube is a blower that can blow leaves.

Regarding claim 19, the means for providing a particulate flow in the secondary tube is a hopper (30).

Regarding claim 20, the direction of the flow can be controlled by user operation.

6. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,964,420 to Hampton as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,630,929 to Medlin.

Hampton discloses all of the limitations of the claims except for a flexible hose. Medlin discloses a material spreader having a flexible hose (46). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the flexible hose of Medlin to the sprayer of Hampton in order to control the discharge direction.

Application/Control Number: 10/825,461

Art Unit: 3752

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent No. 4,474,327 to Mattson et al discloses a fertilizer spreader. U.S. Patent No. 6,793,563 to Daniel discloses a particle blaster assembly with a material line separated from the blower. U.S. Patent No. 4,089,441 to Cole et al. discloses a blower having a hopper.

Page 6

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seth Barney whose telephone number is (571)272-4896. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm (Mon-Fri), first friday off.

Art Unit: 3752

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Scherbel can be reached on (571)272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Seth Barney Examiner Art Unit 3752

sb

David A. Scherbel
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700